

U.S. Courthouse and Post Office
5th Street and Court Avenue
Des Moines
Folk County
Iowa

HABS No. IA-36

HABS
IOWA
77-DESMO,
21-

PHOTOGRAPHS

WRITTEN HISTORICAL AND DESCRIPTIVE DATA

Historic American Buildings Survey
National Park Service
Department of the Interior
Washington, D.C. 20240

HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY

HABS
IOWA,
77-Desmo,
21-

COURTHOUSE AND POST OFFICE

HABS No. IA-36

Location: Northeast corner of Fifth Street and Court Avenue, Des Moines, Polk County, Iowa.

Significance: One of the finest nineteenth-century public buildings in Des Moines.

PART I. HISTORICAL INFORMATION

A. Physical History:

1. Dates of construction: The original two-and-a-half story building was built from 1867 to 1871 (6: 177*; 10: 393). The third floor added to this building and a three-story wing to the north were built from 1885 to 1890 (15: 21; 20: 36).
2. Date razed: Mid September 1968.
3. Architects: Alfred B. Mullett, Supervising Architect of the United States Treasury, was the architect for the original two-and-a-half story building. He was the Supervising Architect at the time that the site was purchased, and he continued in this post until after the original building was completed in 1871 (6: 186; 10: 393; 21: 35).

Mifflin E. Bell, Supervising Architect of the United States Treasury, was the architect of the enlargement of the building. The first plan for the enlargement, the addition of the third story to the original building, was prepared by his predecessor in the office, James G. Hill (13: 18). The construction of the enlargement, which ultimately included a large wing to the north, did not begin until well into 1885, by which time Bell had been in the office almost a year (15: 21, 73; 14: 3). Bell was succeeded in 1887 by William A. Freret, but by that time the entire building was ready for the roof (17: 3, 20, 65). William H. Windrim followed Freret in 1889, and the building was completed in 1890 (19: 3; 20: 36).

* Please refer to Sources of Information, below. The first number refers to the document, the second number to the page number of that document.

4. Contractors, suppliers, etc.:

Original building of 1867-1871:

N. Osborne of Rochester, N.Y., cut stone (7: 195).

Addition of 1885-1890:

James A. McGonigle, cut Joliet limestone for the third floor above the original two floors (13: 45; 15: 69).
Rice and Bassett, masonry (18: 59).
Bonton Foundry Co., ironwork (18: 59).
Phoenix Iron Co., iron roof, floors, etc. (18: 58; 19: 94).
Willard Baker & Co., roof (18: 56).
Bartlett and Hayward, heating apparatus (18: 56).
Ellithorpe Air-Brake Co., elevators, etc. (19: 91).

5. Chronology:

1865 Sept. 30	Isaiah Rogers resigned as Supervising Architect of the United States Treasury after three years of service (21: 23).
1865 Oct. 1	Alfred B. Mullett took over as Acting Supervising Architect (21: 23).
1866 May 29	Mullett was officially appointed Supervising Architect (21: 23).
1866 Oct. 16	Des Moines site purchased for \$15,000 (6: 186).
1867 June	Construction began (6: 177).
1868 Feb. 10	The contract for cut stone was signed with N. Osborne of Rochester, N.Y., for \$47,735, with a delivery date of 1 Nov. 1868 (7: 194).
1868 Nov. 1	The cut stone was not delivered, thus it was impossible to roof the building that year (7: 195).
1869 -	Satisfactory progress in construction was being made (8: 201).
1870 -	In course of construction (9: 303).
1871 -	Construction was completed (10: 393).
1874 Dec. 31	Mullett left the post of Supervising Architect (21: 35).

- 1876 Aug. 11 James G. Hill became Supervising Architect (21: 34; 11: 663).
- 1882 - Congress appropriated \$45,000 for labor and repairs for the building, and none of this amount was spent this year (12: 19).
- 1883 - Congress appropriated \$40,000 for labor and repairs to the building. Only \$7,608.42 was spent (13: 8).
- 1883 July 10 A contract was signed with James McGonigle in the amount of \$23,235 for the cut stone for the additional story, and the roof was to be left in place until enough stone was available on the site so that the construction could proceed quickly (13: 8, 45). Stonework was in preparation (13: 51). Hill stated that remodeling of the interior of the first floor was very necessary in order to meet the increased demands of the post office (13: 8).
- 1884 Sept. 30 Mifflin E. Bell was appointed Supervising Architect, taking over from Hill (14: 3).
- 1885 Oct. 1 Bell reported that the stonework for the additional story was ready for delivery and that the roof would not be removed until after the winter of 1884-1885 (14: 20). Bell recommended adding a wing to the north side of the building in order to provide the space needed by the post office and the courts. There was room available on the site for the new wing. He also recommended that this wing be constructed at the same time as the new third story (14: 20). Congress appropriated an additional \$50,000 for the new third floor and for the remodeling of the interior (14: 20).
- 1885 - Congress appropriated another \$45,000 for the extension and completion of the building. The funds would pay for a wing 27' x 54' in plan, which Bell stated would be barely enough for present needs (15: 22, 63).
- 1885 Sept. 30 The contract for the Joliet limestone was completed (15: 68, 69).

- 1885 Oct. 1 The additional story was in course of construction, the old roof having been removed preparatory to strengthening the lower floors. The temporary roof on the second floor was nearly completed (5: 21, 73).
- 1886 - The stone and brickwork of the new third floor were completed (16: 20).
- 1886 Oct. 1 Congress had appropriated enough money so that the wing to the north could be the full width of the building. Plans had been prepared and the excavation had been completed. Concrete work was in progress (16: 20). Contracts had been made for the basement walls of the new north wing, and work was to commence within a week (16: 21).
- 1887 Jan. 20 Rice and Bassett contracted for masonry for \$37,775 (18: 59).
- 1887 June 24 The Bonton Foundry Co. contracted for iron work for \$6,000 (18: 59).
- 1887 Oct. 1 William A. Freret had been appointed Supervising Architect, succeeding M. E. Bell, and signed his first annual report (17: 3, 65). Work was advancing rapidly and the entire building was ready for the roof, for which proposals would be invited immediately (17: 20).
- 1887 Nov. 1 Phoenix Iron Co. contracted for "iron roof, floors, etc.," for the sum of \$26,847 (18: 59; 19: 94).
- 1888 May 12 Willard Baker & Co. contracted for the roof for \$8,754.85 (18: 56).
- 1888 June 21 Cudell and Lehman contracted for "completion" for \$76,889 (18: 56).
- 1888 Oct. 18 Bartlett and Hayward contracted for the heating apparatus for \$14,875 (18: 56).
- 1889 Mar. 26 James H. Windrim was appointed Supervising Architect (19: 3).
- 1889 June 25 Ellithorpe Air-Brake Co. contracted for the "elevators, etc.," for \$8,580 (19: 91).

- 1889 Sept. 30 By this date the heating apparatus, all interior finish work, and the elevator work had been completed. Completion of the "approaches" was expected soon, and total completion was expected in January 1890 (19: 29). An expenditure of \$1,891 was made from a fund for vaults, safes, and locks for public buildings (19: 88).
- 1890 Sept. 30 By this date all work had been completed, including approaches, some decorative painting, and many minor items. The building had been occupied for several months (20: 36).

Table of expenditures:

Original Building 1867-1871

Date	Total Cost to Date	Source
1867 Sept. 30 ¹	\$28,964.20	6: 186
1868 Sept. 30	67,562.18	7: 201
1869 June 30	140,506.41	8: 207
1870 June 30	194,839.64	9: 303
1871 June 30 ²	236,437.00	10: 408

1. This amount includes the price of the site, which was purchased in 1886 for \$15,000 (6: 186, 189).
2. In addition, for the year ending 30 June 1871, \$5,316.72 were spent from the appropriation for heating apparatus for public buildings (10: 411).

Additions 1885-1890

Date	Total Cost to Date	Source
1884 Sept. 30	\$19,511.69	15: 22
1885 Sept. 30	34,931.09	15: 22
1886 Sept. 30	54,950.90	16: 21
1887 Sept. 30	109,521.90	17: 20
1888 Sept. 30	170,731.25	18: 20
1889 Sept. 30	300,022.05	19: 29
1890 Sept. 30	330,589.06	20: 36

B. Process of Design:

Little information appears in the Reports of the Supervising Architect concerning the process of architectural design. Some inferences may be made, however.

The criteria for selection of sites for public buildings are given. Lots must be large enough so that free space around the building will allow light to enter and will provide isolation from surrounding buildings for fire protection. In addition, the site must be in a convenient location in the city (6: 164). The site in Des Moines was bounded by city streets on the south and west sides and by alleys on the other two sides, thus achieving the desired light and isolation. The site was located opposite a portion of the public square in which the Polk County Courthouse stands and was conveniently located with respect to the business center of the city in the nineteenth century.

Alfred B. Mullett made this statement on architectural design: that cheap construction ultimately costs more, because the cost of maintenance and repairs is higher than for expensive construction. He allowed no inferior materials (6: 164). In addition he wrote:

No contracts for the erection of buildings have been made, it having been found that changes in the plans and specifications are so frequently required during the construction of public buildings that contracts are in most cases practically abrogated..." (6: 164).
"...thorough advertizing, full information, and perfect plans and specifications are insufficient to procure fair proposals" (6: 165).

It seems reasonable to assume that Mullett's office was capable of preparing plans and specifications that were accurate and sufficiently complete, but that as construction progressed on a job there was a continual need to revise these documents, to such an extent in fact that contracts for erection would soon become useless because the large number of changes desired in the building in turn required changes to the contracts. Contractors then, as today, seized any request for a change in a contract as an opportunity to increase their profits unfairly by charging disproportionately high prices for the change. Nonetheless, one wonders why a large number of changes were "required." Did the bureaucrats who were to occupy the buildings require them? Did politicians attempt to make changes to favor material suppliers among their constituents? Were changes required because available materials, skills, and equipment were not known before preparing the contract documents? Additional information would be needed in order to answer these questions. At any rate, Mullett decided to put up Federal structures using day labor working under a

responsible superintendent and to use contracts only to the extent necessary for the purchase of materials. Perhaps with such a method of construction, only the general architectural design had to be completed before construction began, and matters of detail could be developed as work proceeded. Thus changes in the work could be accommodated in the successive series of detailed drawings as they were normally produced.

For the portion of the building constructed from 1885 to 1890 there is again little explicit information about the process of design. When Mifflin E. Bell assumed the position of Supervising Architect he commented, however, that the plans which were made to secure Congressional approval were only a small part of the work necessary before contractors could bid accurately (14: 3). Thus we may infer that the contract system was in greater use by this time and that a more nearly complete architectural design had to anticipate the letting of contracts that had been the case twenty years earlier.

Although the construction of 1885-90 was undertaken as one project, it was designed originally as several separate projects of enlargement and remodeling of the original building. These successive projects were designed during the years 1883 to 1886. A Congressional Act of 1882 established a limit of \$100,000 to the funds which could be appropriated for labor and materials for the repair of the building, and appropriated \$45,000, none of which was spent that year (12: 13). It would appear that during 1883 a design was prepared under James G. Hill, Supervisory Architect, for the addition of a third story, since the contract for supplying the cut stone for it was signed on July 10 of that year. This addition thus constituted the first design project. The second one, which was mentioned in the Report of the same year, was the remodeling of the first floor to meet the greater needs of the post office, and an increased appropriation was requested for this work (13: 8). An estimate of cost and possibly a preliminary design would have been necessary in order to obtain the appropriation. The third project, mentioned in the Report for 1884, was a wing to be added to the north side of the building in order to meet the increased needs of both the post office and the courts for space, and Mifflin E. Bell, who had just become Supervising Architect, recommended that this construction be carried on at the same time as the work already planned for the original building (14: 20). This third project was designed twice, for in 1885 the appropriation granted would permit only a wing 27' x 54' in plan, barely enough for the needs of that time and allowing no space for future growth. The second planning of this north addition involved an area covering most of the available land at the north portion of the site, and the Report for 1886 mentioned that the necessary funds for this larger addition were granted (15: 63; 16: 20). Furthermore, it should be recognized that the work of designing both north additions would have included

revisions, possibly extensive ones, to the design of the third-story addition to the original building and possibly to the plans for the remodeling of the first floor.

Mullett's statement in 1867 that the government work in progress was of a character considerably above that of the best private work of the time is likely to be quite true. In Des Moines at the time no private nor public work could rival the United States Courthouse and Post Office Building in this regard. Only the State capitol building, begun in 1871 and occupied in 1886, is comparable, a building for the completion of which Bell, as a coincidence, had been one of the architects (2: 33). William Freret's Report of 1887 also refers to the quality of construction for the enlargement. He notes: "The acts authorizing work on this building have permitted fireproof construction to be adopted" (17: 20). Fireproof construction at this time may be equated with the best quality of construction.

C. Process of construction:

The Reports of the Supervising Architect provide a good source of information on this subject. In 1867 Alfred B. Mullett reports conditions in the building industry in the United States, and he mentions specific circumstances prevailing in Des Moines which directly influenced his conduct of the work there.

On the national scale, Mullett found that the use of contracts for both the materials and for the labor of construction resulted in many difficulties. One of these was the fact that, since changes in the work were often required, corresponding changes in the contract for such work were then needed, with fraud and litigation often the outcome. Dishonest contractors were even able to obtain changes in their contracts against the wishes of the Supervising Architect (6: 164). Another difficulty was that contractors often bid high on government work on the apparent assumption, Mullett stated, that "the government ought to pay more than a private individual, and that a contract was but an authorized method of dividing the public money among the favored, and that the erection of a government building is but a legal excuse for making contracts." The high bids were sometimes the result of collusion among bidders to raise the low bid above market rates. For these reasons, Mullett avoided the use of contracts for construction labor. Instead he hired a competent superintendent for each building who in turn hired day laborers and directed them personally (6: 164, 165). If competition could have been restricted to people who were competent in their estimating and constructing, Mullett felt that the contract system would be a better way to build, however (7: 179). It should be noted here that the contract system which Mullett envisaged, assuming competent and competitive bidders, would have been one in which the Treasury Department would have entered into several separate contracts--one for

each of the different kinds of work involved in each particular building. It would have still been necessary to coordinate the work of these different contractors, a task which is one of the responsibilities of the present-day general contractor and which Mullett would have had to do or to assign to a superintendent or to some other authorized representative of the Treasury Department.

For the purchase of materials, a condition for which contracts could often not be avoided, Mullett adopted a firm stand. He held contractors to their bid figures, insisting upon dealing with the lowest responsible bidder, and upon not relieving any contractor who claimed to have made an error in his estimate from fulfillment of his legal obligations under the contract. If, on the other hand, all bids came in unreasonably high, he required the bidders to prove that their bids were not above fair market rates. If they could not do so, he would request new bids or he would reject all the bids and have the necessary purchases made on the open market (6: 165). However, under some conditions his firm stand did not produce the needed results. When contractors bid too low for the supplying of materials or manufactured goods, it was usually impossible to force them to comply with their contracts. The main trouble here was with the contractors for cut stone, who often owned or controlled the quarries which were the only source of supply for the particular stone that was specified. These contracts were stringent and contained penalties for non-compliance, but the contractors believed that they could obtain relief from Congress if they could show that the price paid to them was not adequate (7: 177).

In addition to these problems with contracts, Mullett felt that he had a problem with the wages which the government was required to pay. Government workers had been placed on an eight-hour day, but their daily pay was kept at what they had previously earned for ten hours. Mullett held that ten hours of work was not accomplished in eight under the new system and that therefore the cost of public buildings had increased from twenty to twenty-five percent. He preferred the former law, under which the Federal government conformed to the prices that were customary in each different locality. He saw no need for the regulation of wages (7: 177, 178).

The last problem which Mullett mentioned was that of obtaining "competent and energetic superintendents." He wanted the Supervising Architect to have the right to name or appoint the superintendents, since it was the Supervising Architect who was responsible for the cost and the management of the work (7: 177). It appears that he had to take people appointed by others. In addition, he felt that the best results were obtained only when the superintendents gave their full time to the job. Thus they should not be allowed to attend to private business while on the job, nor should they be gentlemen of

high social standing. Such gentlemen, he had found, only nominally did the work. In large cities he wanted the right to hire resident architects to "act as a direct check on the superintendents," the architects functioning as direct representatives of the Supervising Architect (12: 179).

The problems mentioned above were ones encountered throughout the country in Treasury Department work. The United States Courthouse and Post Office in Des Moines was begun in June 1867, and Mullett reported some similar problems there:

Great difficulty has been experienced in procuring good material at anything like satisfactory rates. The exorbitant price demanded for small stone induced me to use clean, coarse gravel, so common in the neighborhood, for the concrete foundations. The city being built on an alluvial deposit, their stability will be severely tested. The foundations and a portion of the basement walls have been laid, but the progress and character of the work have not been quite satisfactory, from the extreme difficulty of procuring competent workmen. Steps have, however, been taken which will obviate all cause of the complaint (6: 177).

Another difficulty in Des Moines arose with respect to the critical contract for supplying all the cut stone above the water table. The problem arose not as the result of any failure on the part of the contractor, it would appear, but as the result of a strike which made it impossible for the contractor to meet the delivery date. The contract was executed on 10 February 1868 for delivery completed by November 1 of that year. Mullett wrote that with delivery when contracted for, the building could have been roofed "during the present season," that is, 1868 (7: 194). In the next year's report he stated that with delivery as per contract, the whole job could have been finished by 1869 (8: 201).

For 1869, however, it was reported that progress was satisfactory, and: "The workmanship throughout is of good quality, and the building satisfactory, both in cost and in appearance" (8: 201). During the year ending 30 June 1871 the heating apparatus was paid for out of a separate appropriation, indicating that its installation took place during that year at the latest (10: 411). In 1871, the original building was completed (10: 393).

Comparing the cost per cubic foot, this building was the least costly to build of several others of comparable construction, as the following list shows:

New buildings, Class I

Des Moines, Courthouse and Post Office	\$0.33
Madison, Wisconsin	0.43
Portland, Maine	0.51
Springfield, Illinois	0.35

Old buildings, Class I

Baltimore, Maryland Courthouse	0.39
Indianapolis, Indiana	0.3625 (8: 211)

For the work of 1885 to 1890 (see Chronology), it appears likely that the Treasury Department may have been able to dispense with the hiring of day labor under the close supervision of a superintendent, and that the work of construction was done under a system of several contracts, many of which may have included the required labor. A definite conclusion cannot be reached with the information available in the Reports, for the total cost of contracts mentioned amounts only to about two thirds of the total cost of the work. However, it may be concluded that, since the bills for the several contracts were paid by the Treasury Department, the system of construction under a general contractor was certainly not in use.

D. Historical Context:

- 1843 The city of Des Moines was laid out. It was then called Fort Des Moines.
- 1857 Des Moines was made the State capital.
- 1864 In the fall of the year the Chicago North Western Railway reached the town of Nevada, Iowa, thirty some miles north of Des Moines on its way westward across the State from Chicago.
- 1866 In August the Des Moines Valley Line reached Des Moines from Keokuk, Iowa, in the southeast corner of the State. It was the first railroad to reach the city (3: 184).
- 1867 The Rock Island Railroad arrived in Des Moines from Chicago going west (3: 185).
- 1869 The transcontinental railroad was completed. Its most vital function, according to historian Samuel Eliot Morison, was to people the region which it crossed over (4: 743, 744).

1880- During this decade the population growth of Des Moines was the
1890 greatest for any decade in the nineteenth century--2.7 times
that for the preceeding decade and 2.3 times that for the
following decade.

The original building was erected shortly after the railroads arrived
in Des Moines. The additions to the building were built during the
decade of the greatest nineteenth-century population growth.

Population (Source: the United States Census)

Year	Des Moines	Polk County	Iowa
1850	502	4,513	192,214
1860	3,965	11,625	674,913
1870	12,035	27,857	1,194,020
1880	22,408	42,395	1,624,615
1890	50,093	65,410	1,911,896
1900	62,139	82,629	2,231,853

PART II. ARCHITECTURAL INFORMATION

A. Original Building:

In plan, the building was 120' x 80', the larger dimension indicating
the south and north walls, and the smaller east and west. The
building was two-and-a-half stories high with a mansard roof. The
original building contained five bays on its western and eastern
walls. The exterior walls were of Joliet limestone (5: 167).

B. Final Building:

The final building had four bays on the east and west walls added to
the original five there. The Supervising Architect's Report for 1885
includes an engraving showing five new bays on the west side, but only
four of these were built. The tower, shown on the west wall, also
varies from the tower as built. In the engraving the tower has a roof
in the form of a tall cloister vault; as built, its roof was pyramidal
in form. The design in the engraving has a Baroque quality; that
built is rather Queen Anne.

On stylistic grounds it is difficult to explain why the building as
completed in 1890 retained the forms of the Second Empire style, since
as Henry-Russell Hitchcock points out, the style had ceased to be
popular in the country for government buildings by 1875 (1: 116).
Since the original building was simple in massing and reasonably
simple in its classic-inspired exterior details, it might have been
terminated in a roof of low pitch and simple design. It seems possible

that the governing reasons that dictated the adherence to the Second Empire style were practical ones, not stylistic. In the construction of the original building, Mullett had been concerned about the adequacy of the foundations, especially resting on the alluvial soil of Des Moines (6: 177). The original building, counting its mansard-roofed attic story, had three floors of usable interior space, not two, most likely. To add a story to this building and not retain the mansard roof (which contained the top story) would mean the addition of two new stories of stone exterior walls upon the two stories of wall already standing, thereby considerably increasing the weight upon foundations and soil of less bearing capacity than desirable. It appears likely then that such practical considerations may have strongly dictated the retention of a mansard-roofed design, even though it would have been old fashioned for its time. Since the original building was mansard-roofed, the retention of this feature might have met with greater acceptance in Des Moines than if it had been proposed for a new structure.

PART III. SOURCES OF INFORMATION

1. Hitchcock, Henry-Russell. Architecture: Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries. 2nd edition. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1963.
2. Iowa. Legislative Documents. Final Report of the Board of Capital Commissioners to the Governor of Iowa, June 30, 1866.
3. McFarland, Julian E. The Pioneer Era on the Iowa Prairies. Lake Mills, Ia.: Graphic Publishing Co., 1969.
4. Morison, Samuel Eliot. The Oxford History of the American People. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.
5. U.S., Treasury Department. A History of Public Buildings Under the Control of the Treasury Department. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1901.
6. U.S., Treasury Department. Report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the State of Finances for the Year 1867.
7. U.S., Treasury Department. Report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the State of Finances for the Year 1868.
8. U.S., Treasury Department. Report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the State of Finances for the Year 1869.
9. U.S., Treasury Department. Report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the State of Finances for the Year 1870.

10. U.S., Treasury Department. Report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the State of Finances for the Year 1871.
11. U.S., Treasury Department. Report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the State of Finances for the Year 1876.
12. U.S., Treasury Department. Annual Report of the Supervising Architect to the Secretary of the Treasury for the Year Ending September 30, 1882.
13. U.S., Treasury Department. Annual Report of the Supervising Architect to the Secretary of the Treasury for the Year Ending September 30, 1883.
14. U.S., Treasury Department. Annual Report of the Supervising Architect to the Secretary of the Treasury for the Year Ending September 30, 1884.
15. U.S., Treasury Department. Annual Report of the Supervising Architect to the Secretary of the Treasury for the Year Ending September 30, 1885.
16. U.S., Treasury Department. Annual Report of the Supervising Architect to the Secretary of the Treasury for the Year Ending September 30, 1886.
17. U.S., Treasury Department. Annual Report of the Supervising Architect to the Secretary of the Treasury for the Year Ending September 30, 1887.
18. U.S., Treasury Department. Annual Report of the Supervising Architect to the Secretary of the Treasury for the Year Ending December 31, 1888.
19. U.S., Treasury Department. Annual Report of the Supervising Architect to the Secretary of the Treasury for the Year Ending September 30, 1889.
20. U.S., Treasury Department. Annual Report of the Supervising Architect to the Secretary of the Treasury for the Year Ending September 30, 1890.
21. Wodehouse, Lawrence. "Alfred E. Mullett and His French Style Government Buildings." Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians 31 (March 1972): 22-37.

ACTS OF CONGRESS

1866, July 28, V. 14, p. 319. For the purchase, enclosure and
preservation of a parcel of ground, as a site for the erection
of building for the use of the Federal Courts and other
Federal Offices-----\$15,000.00

1867, March 2, V. 14, p. 461. For Court House and Post Office at
Des Moines-----\$5,000.00

1868, July 20, V. 15, p. 114. For Construction-----\$89,008.00

1870, April 20, V. 16, p. 85. For completion-----\$24,575.00

1870, April 20, V. 16, p. 86. For Furniture-----\$12,000.00

1870, July 15, V. 16, p. 295. For completing interior and
for curbing, paving, grading and sewerage-----\$16,000.00

1871, April 20, V. 17, p. 8. For completion-----\$6,856.00

1882, August 7, V. 22, p. 315. For repairs of building
and additional rooms for courts and P. O.; limits
cost to-----\$100,000.00—\$45,000.00

1883, March 3, V. 22, p. 604. For continuation-----\$40,000.00

1884, July 7, V. 23, p. 195. For completion of extension and
remodeling interior of building-----\$50,000.00

1885, March 3, V. 23, p. 480. For extension and
completion-----\$45,000.00

1886, June 30, V. 24, p. 106. For completion of repairs
and enlargement of building-----\$153,000.00
Limits cost to amount appropriated-----\$333,000.00

1910, June 25, V. 36, p. 704. For remodeling and
repairing-----\$60,000.00